

**Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary****Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)****Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

1. Date of Submission: 4/10/2009
2. Agency: Department of Energy
3. Bureau: Environmental And Other Defense Activities
4. Name of this Capital Asset: SR Mission Support Systems
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 019-10-01-15-01-1058-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Operations and Maintenance
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2001 or earlier
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:  
 SR Mission Support Systems (MSS) supports the FEA BRM Business Area, Management of Government Resources, and the DOE's Environment and Defense LOBs and Missions of the Savannah River Site (SRS). These four systems directly support the President's Management Agenda (PMAs) of Human Capital, Real Property Asset Management, Competitive Sourcing, and expanded E-Gov in support of operations. MSS supports DOE's Core Mission of Site and Facility Remediation as described in the DOE Enterprise Architecture Transition Plan (EATP), dated February, 2008, and Strategic Theme 4, Environmental Responsibility (page 57). MSS alignment with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM) for data and technology is shown in Table I.F.3. MSS collaborates internally with the EM Consolidated Infrastructure Investment through the reuse of Hercules for Continuous Asset Management (CAM) to enhance the security profile of the investment.
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
  - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/21/2008
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
 

Name Tam, Lawrence W

Phone Number (803) 952-9614

Email lawrence.tam@srs.gov
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager? Waiver Issued
- b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? 6/25/2007
- c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification? 8/7/2009
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes
  - a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes
  - b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No
    1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?
    2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable

design principles?

3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes

If "yes," check all that apply:

Real Property Asset Management  
Competitive Sourcing  
Expanded E-Government  
Human Capital

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)

Expanded E-Gov-Reuses Site Infrastructure Hercules for Continuous Asset Management (CAM).

Human Capital-Employee skills inventories used to map staffing assignments to work schedules for optimum resource utilization.

Competitive Sourcing-Compiles technical baseline data for bid specifications. Provides security controls to subcontracted systems.

Real Property Asset Management-Monitors and controls processes to comply with technical baseline requirements and protect facility equipment.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) Yes

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? No

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? 10001176 - Environmental Management

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Adequate

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 3

17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)? Yes

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? No

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

2. If "no," what does it address?

b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	11
Software	9
Services	80
Other	0

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and N/A

included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name Conner, Pauline  
 Phone Number 803-952-8134  
 Title FOIA and Privacy Act Officer  
 E-mail pauline.conner@srs.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Yes

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? Yes

### Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acquisition:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance:	156.025	40.112	40.036	41.693	43.085	44.525	46.013	47.553	459.042
TOTAL:	156.025	40.112	40.036	41.693	43.085	44.525	46.013	47.553	459.042
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0.246	0.064	0.065	0.0656	0.0682	0.0688	0.0694	0.07	0.7170
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10

Note: For the multi-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No

a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

Budgets for fiscal years 2009 through 2014 were adjusted to reflect the Savannah River Site Annual Operating Plan (AOP) budget. This adjustment resulted in a decrease in the total lifecycle budget estimate from \$462.681 M (BY2009) to \$459.042 M (BY2010).

### Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/em ail)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
	Cost plus incentive fee, performance based contract planned.	Yes	1/1/2009	1/1/2009	12/31/2013	205.658	No	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes	Morton, Angela	803-952-9236 / a.morton@srs.gov	Level 3	

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

Systems under discussion are currently supported under DOE's prime contract with WSRC. The contract contains objective earned value measurement incentive provision, though not directly with regard to the management of the contractor's internal business systems. The Mission Support Systems addressed by this investment are funded by overhead costs under the current DOE prime contract. The contractor is, however, highly motivated to be innovative in improving the efficiency and cost effectiveness of their business systems and processes in that the contract allows savings achieved in those areas to be redirected to accelerated site cleanup and closure deliverables that are incentive-based.

In the current planning environment, preparations are underway to restructure the contractor configuration at SRS. The Acquisition Plan, dated August 22, 2006 describes the current contracting strategy at Savannah River Site (SRS). The contract would provide DOE direct management control over the IT investment in a performance based contract, with well defined metrics. The current draft contract includes metrics based on the Federal Performance Reference Model (PRM). This performance based Acquisition Plan strategy supports DOE direct management of the IT Investment in accordance with OMB requirements.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done?

The current steady state systems were designed and developed to comply with Section 508. This investment uses a several tools such as Bobby (Watchfire), InFocus (SSB Technologies) and STEP508 to ensure that web applications and web sites are accessible to people with disabilities.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?

Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date?

10/9/2008

1. Is it Current?

Yes

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

### Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at [www.egov.gov](http://www.egov.gov). The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Increase customer satisfaction with the functionality and capability of the implemented solution. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant in TEF and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % customer satisfaction by 10% with functionality and capability of IT delivered solutions.	Implemented COTs product refresh of AIM to SmartPlant Foundation (SPF) during Q3 FY 2008. Customer feedback provided via Customer Satisfaction Survey indicated 100% satisfaction with AIM refresh and PassPort enhancements for Q4.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Optimize use of embedded process control systems to reduce the footprint of SR facilities in support of SRS risk reduction and cleanup strategy	Multiple control rooms exist across SRS areas	Reduce/consolidate control room "footprint" by 5%.	As of Q4 FY2008, metrics are on track for HDBB installation and transfer of 1F alarms to 74F Control Room.
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Perform continuous monitoring through quarterly P&CS Accreditation Boundary (AB) Cyber Security Vulnerability system scans.	FY2008 - Initial P&CS AB scans have been completed.	Discover, prevent, reduce and eliminate cyber vulnerabilities, resulting in no vulnerabilities identified by site independent oversight.	As of Q4 FY2008, completed all vulnerability scans for P&CS AB systems as scheduled. Have implemented a staggered schedule to minimize production impact
2008	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Implement technology refresh of AIM to SmartPlant (SPF) in 50% of site facilities.	Perform technology refresh of AIM to SmartPlant (SPF), to mitigate cyber security issues and transition the SRS automated engineering process to the vendor's follow-on product.	Implement SmartPlant in 50% of site facilities.	Migration of AIM data to the new SPF system was completed in Q3 FY08. Additional facilities will be implemented in SPF, as business requirements dictate.
2008	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Customer impact. Measure by % positive, negative and not applicable impacts made by application enhancements, releases and outages. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % positive impacts by 10%.	AIM to SPF refresh was performed during Q3FY08. Passport and AIM/SPF enhancements and support provided resulted in 100% positive, 0% negative, and 0% neutral impacts.
2009	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Increase customer satisfaction with the functionality and capability of the implemented solution. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % customer satisfaction by 10% with functionality and capability of IT delivered solutions.	Customer satisfaction for Q2 FY09 is 100% as measured by customer survey.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	contractor organizations.							
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Perform continuous monitoring through quarterly P&CS Accreditation Boundary (AB) Cyber Security Vulnerability system scans.	FY2008 - Initial P&CS AB scans have been completed.	Discover, prevent, reduce and eliminate cyber vulnerabilities, resulting in no vulnerabilities identified by site independent oversight.	FY2009 scans for 2nd Quarter have been completed on schedule.
2009	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Increase the number of significant Engineering Business Objects created in SmartPlant.	Perform technology refresh of AIM to SmartPlant (SPF), to mitigate cyber security issues and transition the SRS automated engineering process to the vendor's follow-on product.	Increase the number of significant Engineering Business Objects created in SmartPlant by 10% over previous FY.	The actual number of Business Objects created over the last year is 52,389. This is a 14.5% increase, representing an additional 4.5% increase above target.
2009	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Customer impact. Measure by % positive, negative and not applicable impacts made by application enhancements, releases and outages. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % positive impacts by 10%.	Q4 FY08 baseline is 100% positive impacts. Q1 FY09 and Q2 FY09 continues to be 100% positive impacts.
2010	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Increase customer satisfaction with the functionality and capability of the implemented solution. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % customer satisfaction by 10% with functionality and capability of IT delivered solutions.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2010. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Perform continuous monitoring through quarterly P&CS Accreditation Boundary (AB) Cyber Security	FY2008 - Initial P&CS AB scans have been completed.	Discover, prevent, reduce and eliminate cyber vulnerabilities, resulting in no vulnerabilities identified by site	Reported on a Quarterly basis in FY2010.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy				Vulnerability system scans.		independent oversight.	
2010	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Increase the number of significant Engineering Business Objects created in SmartPlant.	Perform technology refresh of AIM to SmartPlant (SPF), to mitigate cyber security issues and transition the SRS automated engineering process to the vendor's follow-on product.	Increase the number of significant Engineering Business Objects created in SmartPlant by 10% over previous FY.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2010. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2010	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Implement Argus based on project schedule for SRS site facilities.	Actual vs Project schedule	Increase % positive impacts by 10%.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2010. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2011	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Increase customer satisfaction with the functionality and capability of the implemented solution. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % customer satisfaction by 10% with functionality and capability of IT delivered solutions.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2011. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Perform continuous monitoring through quarterly P&CS Accreditation Boundary (AB) Cyber Security Vulnerability system scans.	FY2008 - Initial P&CS AB scans have been completed.	Discover, prevent, reduce and eliminate cyber vulnerabilities, resulting in no vulnerabilities identified by site independent oversight.	Reported on a Quarterly basis in FY2011.
2011	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Evaluate SmartPlant technology per enterprise architecture compliance for	Determine SmartPlant upgrade / improvement needs per Enterprise	Begin SmartPlant upgrade / improvement per analysis results.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2011. Interim results will be reported quarterly.



Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.				improvement needs.	Architecture analysis.		
2011	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Implement Argus based on project schedule for SRS site facilities.	Actual vs Project schedule	Increase % positive impacts by 10%.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2011. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2012	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Increase customer satisfaction by 10% with the functionality and capability of the implemented solution. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % customer satisfaction by 10% with functionality and capability of IT delivered solutions.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2012. Interim results will be reported quarterly.
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Monitoring and Forecasting	Perform continuous monitoring through quarterly P&CS Accreditation Boundary (AB) Cyber Security Vulnerability system scans.	FY2008 - Initial P&CS AB scans have been completed.	Discover, prevent, reduce and eliminate cyber vulnerabilities, resulting in no vulnerabilities identified by site independent oversight.	Reported on a quarterly basis in FY2012.
2012	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement	Optimize SmartPlant technology per enterprise architecture compliance for improvement needs.	Continuous Enterprise Architecture analysis per SmartPlant upgrade / improvement needs	Continue SmartPlant upgrade / improvement.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2012. Interim results will be reported quarterly.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.							
2012	GOAL 5.1 Integrated Management Institute integrated business management approach throughout DOE with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability to include effective line management oversight by Federal and contractor organizations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Customer impact. Measure by % positive, negative and not applicable impacts made by application enhancements, releases and outages. Measure via customer survey sent to customers of solutions implemented within the previous month.	AIM/SmartPlant and Passport customer survey baselines.	Increase % positive impacts by 10%.	Actual results will be available end of FY 2012. Interim results will be reported quarterly.

### Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?:

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment?

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:
--

**Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)**

<b>Name of System</b>	<b>Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?</b>	<b>NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)</b>	<b>Has C&amp;A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)</b>	<b>Date Completed: C&amp;A</b>	<b>What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)</b>	<b>Date Completed: Security Control Testing</b>	<b>Date the contingency plan tested</b>
SR AIM							
SR Passport (Work Management System)							
SR Process Control and Support							

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

The agency contracts with SRNS and WSRC specify compliance with all laws, regulations and DOE Orders. Changes to applicable orders are assessed by each contractor for impact. If changes require additional resources (i.e., funding, FTEs) or procedural change (i.e., modification of system configuration, change in security profile, etc.) the contractor is required to submit a Compliance Assessment and Implementation Report to DOE outlining actions required to implement changes. This approach ensures proper communication and understanding of changes in requirements that may affect overall mission and/or work completion. Mission Support Systems are certified to DOE Order 205.1, which meets the objectives of state and federal regulations, executive orders, national security directives, and OMB A-130, App. III.

Contractor security procedures are monitored, verified and validated by a comprehensive set of controls that include inbound and outbound monitoring of connections, internal system log/audit reviews, annual risk assessments (and monthly risk reviews) and continuous monitoring. Contractor security procedures and performance is surveyed annually by the DOE Savannah River Operations Office and independently assessed by the Office of Independent Oversight (OIO) and the DOE Inspector General. In addition, MSS users participate in annual security awareness training as part of the Savannah River Site annual Consolidated Annual Training (CAT) Program.

**8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:**

<b>(a) Name of System</b>	<b>(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)</b>	<b>(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)</b>	<b>(d) Internet Link or Explanation</b>	<b>(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)</b>	<b>(f) Internet Link or Explanation</b>
SR AIM	No	No	No, because the system does not contain personally identifiable information.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
SR Passport (Work Management System)	No	No	No, because the system does not contain personally identifiable information.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
SR Process Control and Support	No	No	No, because the system does not contain personally identifiable information.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

**Details for Text Options:**

Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

**Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)**

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. SR Mission Support Systems

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? No

a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. 345-000

<b>4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:</b> Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Facilities Management	Support the construction, management and maintenance of facilities for an organization.	Back Office Services	Asset / Materials Management	Facilities Management			No Reuse	44
Outbound correspondence management	Manage internal initiated communication between an organization and its stakeholders.	Process Automation Services	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management			No Reuse	25
Process Tracking	Allow the monitoring of activities within the business cycle.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	32

a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

<b>5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:</b> To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.				
FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	

## Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

**5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:**

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent Technologies	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Facilities Management	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Component Framework	User Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements		
	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements		
	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements		
	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements		
	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements		
	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements		
	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements		
Facilities Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Process Tracking	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Facilities Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Process Tracking	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Facilities Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Process Tracking	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

**5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:**

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Facilities Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Dependent Platform	

a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

Yes

a. If "yes," please describe.

**Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)****Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)**

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
  - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 5/28/2008
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
  - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

The risks were updated and mitigation actions and planned responses (should the risks occur) were documented as follows:

Lack of resources available to implement PC&S facility required systems/modifications with potential impact to production schedules and operations. Impact: Medium

Probability: Medium

Mitigation Actions: Hire or subcontract resources and purchase material (hardware and software) required to meet facility schedules with ramp up in Q3-Q4 FY2008.

Planned Response should Risk Occur: Expedite hiring/subcontracting resources and purchasing material (hardware and software). Review and implement alternative PC&S production solutions.

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
  - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
  - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

**Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)**

1. Was an operational analysis conducted? Yes
  - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed. 6/2/2008
  - b. If "yes," what were the results?

Operational Analysis (OA) Process

Financial reviews are conducted each month. Performance monitoring is conducted each quarter. Risk management plans are developed annually, with monthly reviews. Performance against milestones (Section III.D.2) is monitored on a quarterly basis. Results are reviewed by the contractor with DOE-SR management to evaluate the need for changes. The need for system upgrades, or DME, is driven by the Risk Management Analysis, as well as performance metrics from customer surveys.

MSS scored "green" in all self assessment categories in the June 2, 2008 OA, including the following areas:

Customer Results: Customer response is measured after application enhancement/upgrade based on meeting schedule, budget and performance results. Customer survey indicated all positives (meets or exceeds expectations).

Strategic and Business Results: AIM/SmartPlant continued to support DOE Strategic Goal 5.1, Integrated Management by maintaining the technical design bases in support of site engineering processes. PC&S continued to support DOE Strategic Goal 4.1 by controlling processes in facilities supporting cleanup and waste processing.

Financial Performance: At the June 2, 2008 Operational Analysis (OA), SR MSS was on plan for FY2008 YDT (10/1/07-4/30/08). The variance was 8.57% actuals to plan.

- c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

- a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor and Government

Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
FY04	Steady State Operation	9/30/2004	\$41.773000	9/30/2004	\$41.773000	0	\$0.000000
FY05	Steady State Operation	9/30/2005	\$37.624000	9/30/2005	\$34.617000	0	\$3.007000
FY06	Steady State Operation (Actual cost is through 9 months)	9/30/2006	\$37.870000	9/30/2006	\$38.619000	0	-\$0.749000
FY-06-01	Steady State Operation (October 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006)	6/30/2006	\$27.453000	6/30/2006	\$27.453000	0	\$0.000000
FY-06-02	Steady State Operation - July 1, 2006 - September 30, 2006	9/30/2006	\$10.416000	9/30/2006	\$11.166000	0	-\$0.750000
FY-06-03	Complete Operational Analysis, Part II	9/22/2006	\$0.001000	9/22/2006		0	
FY07	Steady State Operation	9/30/2007	\$39.004000	9/30/2007	\$39.291000	0	-\$0.287000
FY-07-01	Steady State Operation	9/30/2007	\$38.607000	9/30/2007	\$38.894000	0	-\$0.287000
FY-07-02	Complete Acquisition Plan for SRS Rebid (IT Services SB Set-Aside).	11/15/2006	\$0.001000	8/22/2006	\$0.001000	85	\$0.000000
FY-07-03	Issue SRS Rebid Solicitation (Includes IT investment)	11/30/2006	\$0.001000	12/15/2006	\$0.001000	-15	\$0.000000
FY-07-04	SR Mission Support Systems (SR MSS) - EM Recertification - Last C&A date: June 30, 2004.	6/30/2007	\$0.001000	6/8/2007	\$0.001000	22	\$0.000000
FY-07-05	Complete evaluation of AIM Smartplant upgrade.	9/28/2007	\$0.001000	9/28/2007	\$0.001000	0	\$0.000000
FY-07-06	Funding decision on security POAMs	4/30/2007	\$0.001000	4/30/2007	\$0.001000	0	\$0.000000
FY-07-07	Security - Align site systems to EM eRAMS. Develop and implement NIST-based C&A processes and procedures.	6/29/2007	\$0.391000	6/8/2007	\$0.391000	21	\$0.000000
FY-07-08	C&A Complete	6/30/2007	\$0.001000	6/8/2007	\$0.001000	22	\$0.000000
FY08	Steady State Operation	9/30/2008	\$40.176000	9/30/2008	\$40.100000	0	\$0.076000
FY-08-01	Steady State Operation	9/30/2008	\$35.681000	9/30/2008	\$35.615000	0	\$0.066000
FY-08-02	ST&E Testing Complete	6/30/2008	\$0.001000	3/7/2008	\$0.001000	115	\$0.000000
FY-08-03	Contingency Plan Testing	6/30/2008	\$0.001000	6/6/2008	\$0.001000	24	\$0.000000
FY-08-04	Risk Management Plan Update	6/30/2008	\$0.001000	5/28/2008	\$0.001000	33	\$0.000000
FY-08-05	Implement administrative	12/31/2007	\$2.201000	12/31/2007	\$2.201000	0	\$0.000000



Exhibit 300: SR Mission Support Systems (Revision 19)

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
	processes and technical tools for cyber security configuration management.						
FY-08-06	Implement vulnerability and patch management processes.	12/31/2007	\$1.290000	12/31/2007	\$1.290000	0	\$0.000000
FY-08-07	Unclassified network segmentation plan.	7/31/2008	\$0.689000	7/25/2008	\$0.690000	6	-\$0.001000
FY-08-08		3/31/2008	\$0.311000	3/30/2007	\$0.300000	367	\$0.011000
FY-08-09	Complete Operational Analysis.	5/30/2008	\$0.001000	6/2/2008	\$0.001000	-3	\$0.000000
FY09	Steady State Operation	9/30/2009	\$40.101000	2/28/2009	\$16.479000	214	\$23.622000
FY10	Steady State Operation	9/30/2010	\$41.758000				
FY-10-01	Steady State Operation	9/30/2010	\$41.757000				
FY-10-02		6/30/2010	\$0.001000				
FY11	Steady State Operation	9/30/2011	\$43.146000				
FY12	Steady State Operation	9/30/2012	\$44.595000				
FY13	Steady State Operation	9/30/2013	\$46.083000				
FY14	Steady State Operation	9/30/2014	\$47.623000				
<b>Project Totals</b>		<b>9/30/2014</b>	<b>\$459.753000</b>	<b>2/28/2009</b>	<b>\$210.879000</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>\$248.874000</b>